

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants propose amending Figures 22A and 23 as shown in the attached replacement sheets of drawings.

Figure 22A has been amended by changing "22B" to "22A". In addition, the word "COMARATIVE" has been changed to "COMPARATIVE".

Figure 23 has been amended by adding the designator "(PRIOR ART)".

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 9-13 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 14-20 are added. The new claims are directed to the elected invention. Claims 1-8 and 14-20 are pending.

I. Amendments

Figures 22A and 23 have been amended, and replacement sheets of drawings are attached. Figure 22A has been amended by changing "22B" to "22A". In addition, the word "COMARATIVE" has been changed to "COMPARATIVE". Figure 23 has been amended by adding the designator "(PRIOR ART)".

The specification has been amended to provide correct figure descriptions and correct typographical errors.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 1; page 13, lines 2-4; and Figure 14.

New claims 14-16 and 18-20 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 12, line 24 to page 13, line 2; Figure 14; and original claims 9 and 13.

New claim 17 is supported by the original disclosure, for example original claims 1 and 5.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

II. Election/Restriction

Applicants confirm the election of Group I, claims 1-8. Non-elected claims 9-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The new claims are directed to the elected invention of Group I. Claims 14-16 depend from claim 1, and claim 17 is a combination of prior claims 1 and 5 with revised language to address the 35 USC 112 rejections. Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17.

III. Specification objections

The disclosure has been objected to for the reasons noted in the action.

The brief description of Figure 20 has been revised to provide an accurate description. Applicants note that other figure descriptions have also been revised in order to accurately describe the figures.

With respect to page 16, line 4, the drawings have been amended to provide a Figure 22A.

With respect to page 17, line 2, the spelling of "differential" has been corrected.

Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

IV. Drawing objections

The drawings have been objected to for the reasons noted in the action.

The drawings have been amended to provide a Figure 22A, and to change the word "COMARATIVE" to "COMPARATIVE".

With respect to replacing the word "COMPARATIVE" with "PRIOR ART", Applicants respectfully traverse. The drawings labeled as "COMPARATIVE" are not necessarily indicative of what is old and well known in the current state of the art. Therefore, Applicants submit that labeling those drawings as "PRIOR ART" would be misleading and inaccurate.

V. 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. The language "in the order of" is no longer used. In addition, the claim now recites front and rear sections of the suspension arms.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

VI. 35 USC 103 rejection

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama et al. (US 6,286,619) in view of Fukuda et al. (US 5,156,070).

In addition, claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama et al. in view of Fukuda et al, and further in view of Peterson (US 5,364,114).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Uchiyama and Fukuda do not teach or suggest a suspension arrangement structure as claimed, including front fitting parts or rear fitting parts of left and right suspension arms that are rotatable about a common axis.

Uchiyama is characterized in the rejection as having suspension arms 63 that are arranged to the front and rear of a differential mechanism. The elements 63, which include upper and lower sets of wishbones 66, 68, are pivotally connected to frame assembly 22 by pivots 64 (column 5, lines 5-7; Figure 3). The upper and lower wishbones 66, 68 pivot about axes A and B (Figures 2 and 3). As shown in Figure 2 of Uchiyama, the pivot axis A of the upper left wishbone 66 is spaced from the pivot axis A of the upper right wishbone 66. Therefore, Uchiyama does not disclose front or rear fitting parts of the left and right wishbones 66 being rotatable about a common axis.

Fukuda does not teach or suggest what is missing from Uchiyama. Fukuda does not teach front or rear fitting parts of left and right suspension arms being rotatable about a common axis.

For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Uchiyama and Fukuda. Claims 2-8 depend upon claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejections to claims 2-8.

VII. New claims 14-20

Claims 14-16 depend upon claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1.

With respect to claims 17-20, claim 17 is similar to previous claim 5. Previous claim 5 was rejected with an indication that Uchiyama discloses a shock absorber 78 linked to the right and left suspension arms 63. Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of "a shock absorber linked to the right and left suspension arms" is being interpreted too broadly and in a manner inconsistent with Applicant's specification.

As disclosed in Applicant's disclosure, the shock absorber linked to the right and left suspension arms dampens the movements of each suspension arm. See Figures 15-19 and the description therefore. Uchiyama does not function in this manner so that one of the shock absorbers 78 is not linked to both the left and right wishbones 68.

In Uchiyama, two shock absorber 78 are provided, one absorber 78 linked to the bottom left wishbone 68 and one absorber 78 linked to the bottom right wishbone 68 (see Figure 3). In Uchiyama, a single absorber 78 is not linked to both the left and right wishbones 68. Although both wishbones 68 and the absorbers 78 are connected to the frame assembly 22, the movement of the left wishbone is not dampened by the shock absorber 78 linked to the right wishbone, and the movement of the right wishbone is not dampened by the shock absorber 78 linked to the left wishbone.

Claims 18-20 depend upon claim 17 and are patentable along with claim 17.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: February 24, 2006

By: 

James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443
CBH/JAL/lad